

### REMARKS

Claims 34-37, 39 and 41-53 are pending in the application with claims 34, 35, 46, 49 and 53 being independent. Claims 38 and 40 have been canceled and claims 34, 35, 39 and 41 have been amended.

Claims 34-37 have been rejected as being anticipated by Porowski (U.S. 6,329,215). Each of independent claims 34 and 35 has been amended to incorporate the features of claims 38 and 40 so as to recite that "the electro luminescence layer is formed by printing." Porowski does not describe or suggest forming a layer in this manner. For at least this reason, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 34, 35 and 38-45 have been rejected as being anticipated by Yamazaki (U.S. 6,384,427). In making this rejection, the Examiner contends that the recitation in independent claims 34 and 35 of "pressurizing the processing chamber to reach a pressure equal to or higher than the atmospheric pressure" is described by Yamazaki at col. 7, line 9. However, while Yamazaki discloses "The polymer type organic EL material is formed into the light-emitting layer under normal pressure", Yamazaki fails to describe or suggest the step of "pressurizing". For at least this reason, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 46 and 48 have been rejected as being anticipated by Kuribayashi (U.S. 6,175,345). In making this rejection, the Examiner contends that the method recited in claim 36 is described by Kuribayashi at col. 11, lines 1-11. However, that passage of Kuribayashi is directed to applying an adhesive for use in adhering a TFT substrate 3 to an EL substrate 6, and is not directed to "forming an electro luminescence layer comprising an organic material by printing over the substrate," as recited in claim 46. Nor does Kuribayashi elsewhere describe or suggest forming an electro luminescence layer in the manner recited in claim 46. Accordingly, for at least this reason, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 49 and 51 have been rejected as being anticipated by Aoki (U.S. 5,488,266). In making this rejection, the Examiner contends that the method recited in claim 49 is disclosed by Aoki at col. 7, line 8-19. However, this portion of Aoki is directed to adhering the back electrode of an electro-luminescence device and a back protective material, and in no way

describes or suggests "printing a layer comprising an electro luminescence material dissolved in a second solvent over the substrate," as recited in claim 49. Nor does Aoki elsewhere describe or suggest forming an electro luminescence layer in the manner recited in claim 49. Accordingly, for at least this reason, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 38 and 46-53 have been rejected as being obvious over Porowski in view of Aoki.

With respect to claim 34, which has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 38, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because neither Porowski, Aoki, nor any combination of the two describes or suggests forming an electro luminescent layer by printing in a processing chamber pressurized to a pressure greater than atmospheric pressure.

Aoki describes forming a luminous layer by printing. However, Aoki nowhere indicates that such printing is done in an environment having elevated pressure.

Porowski is directed to metalorganic chemical vapor deposition (MOCVD) techniques for forming semiconductors for use in light emitting devices. While these techniques are performed in pressurized environment, they do not involve printing.

Absent impermissible hindsight reconstruction of the invention, nothing in Aoki or Porowski would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the references in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Moreover, even if such motivation could somehow be found, if one were to replace Porowski's MOCVD technique with Aoki's printing technique, there would be no reason to use the elevated pressures of Porowski in conjunction with the printing of Aoki.

For the same reasons, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine Aoki and Porowski so as to include "forming an electro luminescence layer comprising an organic material by printing over the substrate " as recited in claim 46, "printing a layer comprising an electro luminescence material dissolved in a second solvent over the substrate" as recited in claim 49, or "printing a layer comprising an electro luminescence material dissolved in a second solvent over the substrate" as recited in claim 53. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 46, 49, 53 and their dependent claims.

Applicant : Shunpei Yamazaki  
Serial No. : 09/898,067  
Filed : July 5, 2001  
Page : 8 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 12732-054001 / US5067

Enclosed is a \$110 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 20, 2003

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John F. Hayden  
Reg. No. 37,640

**Customer No. 26171**  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40182348.doc